Graham Bradford Lascsak
General Delivery
Rising Star, TX 76471
Telephone: (254) 433-1705
Email: lascsak.fam@gmail.com
Interested Party and Heir, Pro Se

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

In re the Estate of: Decedent. Department: 5 Judicial Officer: Hon. Jessica A. Uzcategui Hearing Date: June 2, 2026 Hearing Time: Per clerk confirmation, hearing set for next business day when filed before 10:00 AM; specific time assigned by court Dept.: 5 Filed by: Graham Bradford Lascsak, Pro Se, Interested Party and Heir	**THOMAS EARL VAN HORN,** **Case No.: 26STPB04272** **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF; DECLARATION OF GRAHAM B. LASCSAK IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

NOTE REGARDING WILL SEARCH LETTER: Concurrently with the filing of this Motion, Movant is transmitting a separate letter to the Clerk of this Court requesting a

search of the Court's will vault and registry pursuant to California Probate Code sections 731 and 8200 et seq. That letter is mailed the next business day following the date this Motion is filed.

NOTICE OF MOTION

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD, AND TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on June 2, 2026, at Per clerk confirmation, hearing set for next business day when filed before 10:00 AM; specific time assigned by court, or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in Department 5 of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, located at 111 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, Graham Bradford Lascsak, appearing pro se as an interested party and heir to the Estate of Thomas Earl Van Horn, will move this Court for an Order reconsidering and vacating the Order entered on or about May 22, 2026, granting the Petition for Appointment of Administrator filed by Teresa Weissenberger.

This Motion is made on the following grounds:

1. The Order was entered in violation of Movant's constitutional right to due process, as Movant timely mailed written objections that were not considered;

2. A diligent search for a testamentary instrument has not been completed, and the decedent's attorney of record, who may have prepared and lodged a will on the decedent's behalf, has not been identified or contacted;

3. The Petition was processed on the consent calendar without adequate notice or opportunity for all interested parties to be heard;

4. Petitioner's own statements regarding the decedent's estate distribution intentions may constitute fraud in the inducement, warranting reconsideration before any administrator assumes authority;

5. The family members identified as potential heirs by the Petitioner, by virtue of their common interest in this estate, constitute a naturally assembled body whose right to collectively designate a representative is protected under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 3 of the California Constitution; and

6. There is no legal mechanism by which this estate can be resolved within thirty days, rendering any urgency claimed by Petitioner or associated parties without legal foundation.

This Motion is based upon this Notice of Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Graham Bradford Lascsak, the records and files of this Court, and upon such other and further evidence and argument as may be presented at the hearing.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1. Thomas Earl Van Horn (hereinafter "Decedent") passed away on March 22, 2026. Decedent resided at 149 South Avenue 54, Apartment 13, Los Angeles, California 90042 at the time of his death.

2. Decedent is survived by no spouse, no children, no grandchildren, and no parents. Decedent's surviving relatives include siblings and the issue of predeceased siblings.

3. Debra Gayle Lascsak, who was Decedent's sister, predeceased the Decedent. Debra Gayle Lascsak was the wife of Thomas Alan Lascsak. Graham Bradford Lascsak is the son of Thomas Alan Lascsak and Debra Gayle Lascsak, and is therefore a nephew of the Decedent and a potential heir at law.

4. Teresa Weissenberger (hereinafter "Petitioner") is alleged to be the last surviving sibling of the Decedent. Petitioner, through counsel Shannon N. Wiezorek, Esq., 3450 E Spring Street, Suite 212, Long Beach, CA 90806, filed a Petition for Appointment of Administrator of the estate of Thomas Earl Van Horn.

5. Notice of the hearing set for May 22, 2026 was mailed to Movant at General Delivery, Rising Star, Texas 76471. Regardless of the postmark date of that notice, Movant did not receive the notice until April 28, 2026. Upon receipt, Movant promptly prepared and mailed written objections to this Court.

6. On May 22, 2026, the matter was called on the consent calendar in Department 5. The Order granting Petitioner's appointment as Administrator was entered on or about May 22, 2026.

7. Movant's timely mailed written objections were apparently not received or entered into the record prior to the hearing. Movant respectfully requests that this Court verify

whether those objections are now in the case file.

8. No will of the Decedent has been located. However, the identity of the Decedent's estate planning attorney, who may have custody of an executed will or codicil, is not yet known. Movant is actively attempting to identify that attorney. A concurrent letter to the Clerk of this Court, transmitted the next business day following the filing of this Motion, requests a search of the Court's will vault and registry pursuant to California Probate Code sections 731 and 8200.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

9. The Decedent, Thomas Earl Van Horn, maintained his personal residence at 149 South Avenue 54, Apartment 13, Los Angeles, California 90042. That apartment has not yet been searched for testamentary instruments or the contact information of Decedent's attorney.

10. Family communications confirm that Levi Lascsak, a sibling of Graham Bradford Lascsak and nephew of the Decedent, has been in contact with Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger and has stated his intention to meet Petitioner in California to access the Decedent's apartment. Levi Lascsak stated in a written text message, which constitutes family record evidence, the following:

"I'm not really interested in dragging this out. Court was last week and everyone had their chance to protest and no one spoke up. I've been talking with Terri and I'm walking her through the process. I have a probate team in California I'm working with and I will meet Terri in California in the next week or two to go to Tom's apartment. If I find the will or his lawyers contact, we will go from there. If we don't find anything, then we will go through the probate process of no will... If any protest is legally submitted, we could

delay this process for weeks or months... Terri as the administrator means nothing if there is a will and means nothing if there isn't a will. However, as admin, we can now get toms keys from the coroner and gain access to the apartment... She has more right to anything of Brads than any one of us as his last surviving sister. However, in my discussions with her, she does not process information effectively which is why I'm walking her through this... I would also recommend everyone just hold tight and give me two weeks to see if we can get this resolved." (Text message of Levi Lascsak, hereinafter "Levi Text," attached as Exhibit A.)

11. Levi Lascsak's own text message is significant for multiple reasons. First, it acknowledges that the Decedent's apartment has not yet been searched and that a will or the contact information of the Decedent's attorney may still be found there. Second, it acknowledges that Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger "does not process information effectively," raising serious questions about her capacity to serve as administrator of an estate under the Independent Administration of Estates Act, which requires informed independent decision-making. Third, Levi Lascsak's reference to a "probate team in California" he is working with suggests coordination with undisclosed parties whose interests and relationships to this estate have not been disclosed to this Court.

12. Petitioner has made statements to family members, upon information and belief, to the effect that the Lascsak family members are not included in the Decedent's will because the Decedent allegedly stated that the Lascsaks "had enough money and didn't need any." These statements are significant for two reasons. First, they acknowledge the possible existence of a will, contradicting the intestate posture of this petition. Second, if Petitioner has knowledge of the Decedent's testamentary intent and has filed an intestate petition without disclosing the existence or possible existence of a will, such conduct may constitute fraud upon this Court and fraud in the inducement, potentially leading to an unnatural distribution of the estate contrary to the Decedent's actual wishes.

13. California Probate Code section 8200 imposes a mandatory duty on any person who has custody of a decedent's will to lodge it with the superior court clerk within thirty days of learning of the death. Failure to do so is a misdemeanor under California law. If Petitioner or any person within her knowledge has custody of, or knowledge of the location of, a testamentary instrument, the obligation to produce it is mandatory and non-waivable.

LEGAL STANDARD

14. California Code of Civil Procedure section 1008 authorizes a party to seek reconsideration of any order based on new or different facts, circumstances, or law. California courts construe this provision liberally in favor of granting reconsideration where the moving party demonstrates a satisfactory explanation for the failure to present the new information earlier. (Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal.3d 227, 233.)

15. Additionally, California Code of Civil Procedure section 473(b) provides for relief from orders taken against a party through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. Where a party's written objections were mailed but not received before the hearing, relief under section 473(b) is appropriate.

16. In probate proceedings, the court exercises broad equitable powers to protect the interests of all heirs and to ensure that administration of an estate proceeds in accordance with the law and the decedent's actual wishes. (Cal. Prob. Code, sec. 7200; Estate of MacLeod (1989) 206 Cal.App.3d 1235.)

ARGUMENT

A. THE ORDER MUST BE RECONSIDERED BECAUSE MOVANT'S TIMELY OBJECTIONS WERE DENIED A HEARING THROUGH NO FAULT OF MOVANT.

17. Movant received notice of the May 22, 2026 hearing on April 28, 2026, and immediately prepared and mailed written objections to this Court. The fact that Movant resides in Rising Star, Texas, and relies upon general delivery mail service, does not diminish the timeliness or validity of those objections. Movant did everything within his power to participate in this proceeding upon receipt of notice.

17a. In addition to mailing written objections, Graham Bradford Lascsak, Thomas Alan Lascsak, and Levi Lascsak each appeared at the May 22, 2026 hearing remotely via the court's Microsoft Teams platform. All three registered their attendance through the Teams interface, selecting the matter identified as "Tom's Estate" when prompted to identify the case for which they were appearing. Their digital check-in constitutes a contemporaneous, timestamped record of their presence and their identification as interested parties in this proceeding.

17b. Despite their registration through the official remote appearance platform, none of the three were recognized by the court when the matter was called. No inquiry was made as to whether any party wished to be heard. The matter was processed on the consent calendar and the Order was entered without acknowledgment that Graham Bradford Lascsak, Thomas Alan Lascsak, or Levi Lascsak were in attendance and available to speak. The court's own Teams platform recorded their presence; the court's own Order ignored it.

17c. The failure to recognize parties who had affirmatively checked in through the court's designated remote appearance system is not a procedural technicality. It is a denial of the

opportunity to be heard at the most basic level. Due process requires not only that notice be given, but that parties who respond to that notice and present themselves at the proceeding are given a meaningful opportunity to participate. (Mathews v. Eldridge (1976) 424 U.S. 319, 333.) Where interested parties registered their attendance through the court's own electronic system and were still passed over without recognition, the hearing cannot be said to have satisfied the constitutional minimum.

17d. Critically, the court's own knowledge of Movant's attendance is confirmed by what occurred after the judge adjourned the hearing. After adjournment, the court clerk contacted Graham Bradford Lascsak, Thomas Alan Lascsak, and Levi Lascsak individually and by name through the Teams platform. The clerk called each of them by name — demonstrating that the court had their attendance information in real time, during the hearing, and before the Order was entered.

17e. The clerk's post-adjournment statements were delivered in rapid succession, in a single breath, including the following: that attendees "might not have heard because of technicalities or bad connection"; that "there is no need to be here"; that "your case is over"; that attendees could "leave"; and that she was "removing" them from the session. These statements were made after the Order had already been entered. No opportunity to be heard was offered at any point.

17f. The manner in which these dismissals were delivered — multiple pre-formed statements compressed into a single rapid exchange — suggests this sequence is not unusual for this venue. The court clerk appeared familiar with the process of dismissing remote attendees after consent calendar matters are disposed of without their participation. If this is a recurring practice, it represents a systemic due process deficiency: parties who comply fully with the court's remote appearance system are routinely present, routinely unacknowledged, and routinely dismissed only after the

matter has concluded. The fact that the clerk knew these parties by name and contacted them after adjournment confirms that their presence was known to the court throughout the proceeding.

18. The consent calendar is designed for uncontested matters. A matter should not be processed on the consent calendar where a timely written objection has been submitted. If Movant's objections were received by the Court but not entered into the record before the hearing, or if they were received after the hearing date due to transit time beyond Movant's control, the appropriate remedy is reconsideration, not forfeiture.

19. To allow the Order to stand under these circumstances would deny Movant his constitutional right to due process under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution. Courts have consistently held that an interested party in a probate proceeding is entitled to notice and an opportunity to be heard before an order affecting his property interests is entered. (Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co. (1950) 339 U.S. 306, 314.)

B. THE PETITION WAS PREMATURE BECAUSE NO ADEQUATE WILL SEARCH HAS BEEN CONDUCTED.

20. A petition for appointment of an administrator for an intestate estate is premature where there is reason to believe a will exists. The Decedent's apartment at 149 South Avenue 54, Apartment 13, Los Angeles, California 90042 has not been searched for testamentary instruments. The identity of the Decedent's estate planning attorney has not been determined. No inquiry has been made of the Court's will vault or registry under California Probate Code sections 731 and 8200 et seq.

21. Levi Lascsak's own text communication acknowledges that a will or the Decedent's

attorney's contact information may be found when the apartment is searched. The Decedent reportedly expressed testamentary intent to Michael Van Horn, asking Michael to serve as executor upon the death of Debra Gayle Lascsak. This communication implies the existence of testamentary planning and possibly a drafted instrument.

22. Petitioner's own alleged statements to family members acknowledge the possible existence of a will and describe the Decedent's stated intentions regarding distribution. If Petitioner has knowledge of the existence of a will or the identity of the attorney who prepared it, she is under a mandatory duty to produce that information under California Probate Code section 8200. Appointing an administrator under intestate procedures while suppressing knowledge of a possible will is contrary to law.

23. Concurrently with this Motion, Movant is transmitting a letter to the Clerk of this Court requesting a search of the Court's will registry and vault under California Probate Code sections 731 and 8201. That letter is transmitted the next business day following the filing of this Motion. The Court is requested to hold the Order in abeyance, or to stay its effect, pending receipt of the results of that search.

C. PETITIONER'S STATEMENTS REGARDING TESTAMENTARY INTENT MAY CONSTITUTE FRAUD IN THE INDUCEMENT.

24. Petitioner has allegedly represented to family members that the Lascsak family members are excluded from the Decedent's estate because the Decedent stated that the Lascsaks "had enough money and didn't need any." This representation is legally significant in two respects.

25. First, this statement acknowledges that the Decedent had expressed opinions about the distribution of his estate, which implies the existence of testamentary planning. A person

who has expressed views about which relatives should or should not benefit from his estate is more likely to have reduced those wishes to a written instrument. Petitioner cannot simultaneously assert that a will exists (through her representations about decedent's intent) and proceed as though no will exists.

26. Second, if Petitioner has knowledge of a will or of the Decedent's attorney and has withheld that information from this Court in order to secure appointment as administrator under intestate procedures, such conduct constitutes fraud upon the Court. Fraud upon the Court is an independent basis for vacating any order obtained through that fraud. (In re Marriage of Melton (1994) 28 Cal.App.4th 931, 937.)

27. The combination of Petitioner's alleged statements about the Decedent's intent, her filing of an intestate petition, and her failure to identify or disclose the Decedent's estate planning attorney creates a pattern that warrants judicial scrutiny before this administrator assumes authority under the Independent Administration of Estates Act.

D. PETITIONER'S CAPACITY TO SERVE AS ADMINISTRATOR IS IN QUESTION, RENDERING THE APPOINTMENT LEGALLY PRECARIOUS.

28. Levi Lascsak's text message explicitly states that Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger "does not process information effectively," and that he is personally walking her through the probate process step by step. Levi Lascsak is the nephew of both the Decedent and the Petitioner. His direct observation of Petitioner's cognitive functioning, offered in his own words, is not secondhand characterization. It is a contemporaneous admission by a family member with personal knowledge of Petitioner's condition.

29. The role of administrator under the Independent Administration of Estates Act is one of significant fiduciary responsibility. An administrator must independently understand

the duties owed to all heirs, must make informed and legally compliant decisions about estate assets without direction from outside parties, and must act exclusively in the interests of the estate as a whole. An administrator who requires a family member to walk her through every procedural step is not exercising independent fiduciary judgment. She is, in effect, delegating the administration of the estate to an unlicensed, unvetted third party and his undisclosed "probate team."

30. Petitioner's own counsel is in the best position to evaluate whether Petitioner can give informed direction to counsel and independently exercise the authority that Letters of Administration confer. Under California Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 1.14, an attorney whose client has diminished capacity may be compelled to take protective action, including seeking appointment of a guardian or conservator. An administrator who stands on the threshold of requiring that protection is not a stable fiduciary for this estate. The appointment of a person of uncertain independent capacity, guided by an undisclosed probate team with their own undisclosed interests, creates a structural defect in the administration of this estate that this Court has the authority and the duty to address. The Sunrise Covenant, as the assembled body of natural heirs identified by Petitioner herself, presents this Court with a constitutionally grounded and legally coherent alternative administrative structure, addressed further in Section E below.

E. THE HEIRS AT LAW CONSTITUTE AN ASSEMBLED BODY WITH CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DESIGNATE THEIR OWN REPRESENTATIVE.

31. Petitioner's own identification of potential heirs in her petition implicitly acknowledges the existence of a class of interested parties with a common legal interest in this estate. By naming family members as interested parties, Petitioner herself established the membership of the assembled body. The First Amendment to the United

States Constitution and Article I, Section 3 of the California Constitution protect the right of persons to assemble and to petition the government for redress of grievances. A group of natural heirs with common inheritance interests has the constitutional right to organize, to deliberate collectively, and to present their unified position to this Court. Petitioner's own filing called them into existence as an interested class.

32. Concurrently with this Motion, Graham Bradford Lascsak appears as Founder and Principal Trustee of Sunrise Covenant, a family covenant established upon the rights and protections secured by the Constitution of the United States. The Sunrise Covenant's foundational instrument is presented to this Court as Exhibit X. The Sunrise Covenant is not a commercial trust. It is a covenant assembly of natural persons with common inheritance interests, organized to participate fully in this probate proceeding and to serve as the identified administrative body for this estate in any circumstance this Court may require. The Sunrise Covenant is designed to be all things to all people in this estate: the standing body of interested heirs, the voice of the family before this Court, and the nominated administrator if circumstances require.

33. The Sunrise Covenant is structured to defer entirely to any discovered will. If a will is found naming an executor, the Covenant yields. If the Court finds Petitioner capable and properly appointed after full hearing, the Covenant yields. The Covenant exists not to obstruct but to ensure that no single individual, whose capacity and independence are already in question, holds unchecked authority over an estate in which multiple interested parties have legal rights. Where a current administrator stands on the threshold of requiring legal protection from her own counsel, and where an undisclosed external probate team is guiding estate decisions from outside the Court's supervision, the Sunrise Covenant offers this Court a transparent, constitutionally grounded, and judicially accountable alternative. The Court is respectfully requested to recognize the standing of the Sunrise Covenant, and the authority of its designated representative Graham Bradford

Lascsak, to file pleadings and communications on behalf of the assembled members, consistent with the rights of assembly and petition enshrined in both the United States and California Constitutions.

F. THIS ESTATE CANNOT BE RESOLVED WITHIN THIRTY DAYS, AND URGENCY CLAIMS ARE WITHOUT LEGAL FOUNDATION.

34. Levi Lascsak's text message urged family members to "hold tight" and allow him two weeks to resolve the estate. This expectation reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of California probate law. The estate of Thomas Earl Van Horn cannot, under any circumstances, be concluded within thirty days. The law imposes mandatory procedural stops that cannot be waived or shortened.

35. First, under California Probate Code section 9100, creditors of the decedent have four months from the date of first issuance of Letters of Administration, or sixty days from the date of mailing of the Notice to Creditors under Probate Code section 9052, whichever is later, to file their claims. This creditor claim period alone takes a minimum of four months from issuance of Letters and cannot be shortened.

36. Second, under California Probate Code section 8800, a personal representative must file an inventory and appraisal of all estate assets within four months of the date Letters are issued. The inventory and appraisal must be prepared by a court-appointed probate referee, a process that itself takes additional time beyond the four-month filing deadline.

37. Third, if the Decedent's estate includes real property located in Los Angeles County, as suggested by his residence at 149 South Avenue 54, Apartment 13, Los Angeles, California 90042, the administration of that property interest requires additional steps including potential tax clearance, probate referee appraisal, and court approval of any sale

or transfer.

38. Fourth, the standard probate timeline in Los Angeles County, even for uncomplicated estates, is eighteen to twenty-four months from the date Letters are issued. The Los Angeles Superior Court Probate Division is among the busiest in the state, and scheduling alone introduces delays beyond any party's control.

39. The representation by any party that this estate can or will be resolved within two to four weeks is factually incorrect and legally impossible. Any urgency claimed by Petitioner or associated parties to rush the appointment of an administrator before a will search is completed, before interested parties are heard, and before the Court has considered this Motion, is not supported by any legitimate legal basis.

G. THE ORDER SHOULD BE STAYED PENDING RESOLUTION OF THIS MOTION AND THE CONCURRENT WILL SEARCH.

40. A stay of the May 22, 2026 Order is necessary to prevent irreparable harm to Movant and other potential heirs. If Petitioner receives Letters of Administration before this Motion is heard, she may take actions under the Independent Administration of Estates Act without prior court approval, including accessing the Decedent's apartment, taking possession of personal property, and making decisions about estate assets that may be difficult or impossible to reverse.

41. Levi Lascsak's text message confirms that the primary purpose for which Letters are sought at this time is to obtain the Decedent's apartment keys from the coroner and gain access to the apartment. This is precisely the type of action that, if taken prematurely, could compromise or destroy evidence of a will, remove documents identifying the Decedent's attorney, and eliminate the possibility of a proper testamentary proceeding.

42. A brief stay pending the outcome of this Motion and the concurrent will search causes no harm to Petitioner. The estate will remain intact. No creditor rights will be affected by a short delay. The only effect of the stay is to preserve the status quo while this Court considers whether the Order was properly entered.

CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF

43. For all of the foregoing reasons, Movant Graham Bradford Lascsak respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Grant this Motion for Reconsideration and vacate the Order entered on or about May 22, 2026, granting Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger's appointment as Administrator;

2. Stay the effect of the May 22, 2026 Order, including the issuance of any Letters of Administration, pending the hearing on this Motion;

3. Order a will search of the Court's will vault and registry under California Probate Code sections 731 and 8200 et seq., and order any person having knowledge of the Decedent's testamentary instruments or estate planning attorney to disclose that information to the Court;

4. Set a hearing date on the merits of the Petition for Appointment of Administrator at which all interested parties, including Movant, may appear and be heard;

5. Recognize the standing of the Sunrise Covenant (In Covenant) and its designated representative, Graham Bradford Lascsak, as the organized body of assembled natural heirs, as identified by Petitioner's own filing, and consider the Sunrise Covenant as the

nominated administrative body for this estate in any circumstance requiring replacement or supplementation of the current appointment, consistent with the Declaration of Administrative Trust filed herewith as Exhibit X; and

6. Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

WHEREFORE, Movant prays for relief as stated above.

Respectfully submitted,

Graham Bradford Lascsak
General Delivery
Rising Star, TX 76471
Telephone: (254) 433-1705
Email: lascsak.fam@gmail.com
Dated: _____

_____

DECLARATION OF GRAHAM BRADFORD LASCSAK IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

I, Graham Bradford Lascsak, declare as follows:

1. I am the Movant in this proceeding and a nephew of the Decedent Thomas Earl Van Horn. My mother, Debra Gayle Lascsak, was a sister of the Decedent. My mother predeceased the Decedent. I am the son of Thomas Alan Lascsak and Debra Gayle Lascsak. I make this declaration from personal knowledge, and if called as a witness, I

could and would testify competently to the following facts.

2. I did not receive the Notice of Petition to Administer Estate until April 28, 2026, regardless of the postmark date on the notice. Upon receipt, I immediately prepared and mailed written objections to this Court.

3. Levi Lascsak is my sibling and a nephew of both the Decedent Thomas Earl Van Horn and the Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger. Levi Lascsak therefore has direct, personal familiarity with both principal parties in this proceeding. Levi Lascsak sent a written text message to family members, a true and accurate copy of which is attached to this Motion as Exhibit A. That text message contains statements by Levi Lascsak acknowledging, among other things, that the Decedent's apartment has not been searched, that a will or attorney contact information may be found there, and that Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger "does not process information effectively." These observations come from a person with direct personal knowledge of the Petitioner's condition, not from a stranger or adversary.

4. I have been informed by family members, and believe it to be true, that Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger made statements to family members to the effect that the Lascsak family is not included in the Decedent's will because the Decedent allegedly stated that the Lascsaks "had enough money and didn't need any." I did not personally witness this statement but received this information from a family source.

5. I am not aware of any formal will search having been conducted. To my knowledge, the Decedent's apartment has not been accessed since his death. The identity of the Decedent's estate planning attorney, if any, is not known to me.

6. I believe a continuance of this matter and a stay of the May 22, 2026 Order are

necessary to protect my rights as a potential heir and to ensure that this Court has complete information before appointing a permanent administrator.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed on _____, 2026, in _____, _____.

_____

Graham Bradford Lascsak

Declarant

_____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Graham Bradford Lascsak, declare that on the date indicated below, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion for Reconsideration of Order Granting Petition for Appointment of Administrator, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and Declaration of Graham Bradford Lascsak upon the following parties by the following method:

Shannon N. Wiezorek, Esq.

Shannon N. Wiezorek (Bar No. 233601), Wiezorek and Geye, APC, 3450 E Spring Street, Suite 212, Long Beach, CA 90806

Attorney for Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger

Service was effected via certified email through rmail.com to the court's MCLE service

address: MCLE@la.org (full email address on file with the Court).

Service was also effected via United States mail, first class postage prepaid, to the address of Petitioner's counsel listed above.

Clerk of the Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
Probate Division
111 North Hill Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on _____, 2026.

_____

Graham Bradford Lascsak

_____

AI DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATION

Generative artificial intelligence (Prosei AI powered by Claude Opus 4.6) was used in the preparation of this filing. The undersigned certifies that all factual assertions, legal authority, and citations have been independently reviewed and verified for accuracy.

_____

Graham Bradford Lascsak

Dated: _____